(e) whether rule 30-A was introduced because IDPL management failed to act to misncoduct occurring under rule 5(7) of the said rules; and

(f) what action Govrenment proposes to take against the IDPL management?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO): (a) to (f) The employees referred to in the question were holding posts below the Board level. The authority competent to take a decision in matters relating to such employees is the management of the company. The issues raised essentially pertained to the internal administration of the company. 10 Unstarred Questions in the 164th Session of Rajya Sabha and 3 questions in the 165th Session of Rajya Sabha have already been answered on this subject matter. According to the information furnished by Indian Drugs & Pharmaceuticals limited (IDPL), the said two officers did not comply with the transfer orders on some pretext or other. Therefore, action against them was taken which finally resulted in termination of their services. The authority competent to take a decision or to review a decision taken by the internal management of the company is the Board of Directors of the company.

2915. *[Transferred to* 24th *March,* 1993]

Drive to Recover Unintended profits from drng companies

2916. SHRI SATISH PRADHAN: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleas ed to sate:

(a) whether Government have launched a major drive to recover unintended profits earned by a number of drug companies on various formulations of drugs manufactured by them instead of depositing the same in DPEA;

(b) if so, the names of the companies, the amount due, since when the amount deposited and present recovery position;

(c) whether the recovery is pending for over 14 years;

(d) if so, whether Government would set up an expert Committee to decide and settle pending claims expeditiously; and

(e) if so, the details thereof?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO): (a) and (c) to (e) Government have been making all efforts to recover the unintended profits earned by number of drug companies due to over-charging of formulations or unauthorised retention of amount to case of bulk drugs as envisaged in para 7(2) of DPCO, 1979, during the currency of DPCO, 1979. However, companies have disputed the computations of liabilities against them and some of the drug companies have gone to Courts and obtained stay orders. Some companies are asking for personal hearings which are being given. V

(b) The details asked for have already been given in reply to the Rajya Sabha Unstarred Question No. 1227 dated 4-3-1993.

2917. *ITransferred to 26th March,* 1993]

Price of Doxy-I

2918. SHRI H. HANUMANTHAP PA: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) when was the price of Doxy-I approved at Rs. 7.20 per pack of three under DPCO, 1979:

(b) whether it is a fact that its price was never approved and the company overcharged the price in connivance with the bureaucrats; and

(e) what action is being taken in the matter?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO) (a) to (c) The position shall be ascertained and facts laid on the Table of the House.